REMARKS

The Office Action dated July 9, 2007 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

As an initial matter, Applicants refer to a phone conversation that took place in July 2007 between Examiner Moore and Applicant's representative regarding item 11 (Oath or Declaration) on the office action summary form PTOL-326 that indicated the Oath or Declaration was objected to for containing informalities. During the phone conversation, it was concluded that the box was checked inadvertently and in fact there is no objection to the Oath or Declaration. Therefore the objection to the Oath/Declaration is moot. Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended by Examiner Moore to Applicant's representative

Claims 1-12 are amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. No new matter has been added and no new issues are raised which require further consideration or search. Claims 1-27 are respectfully submitted for reconsideration.

Claims 1, 6, 13, 18 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by 3GPP TS 33.107 ("3GPP" 3G Security, "Lawful interception Architecture and Function Standard" Release 1999). The Office Action alleged that the subject matter of claim 1 is taught by various portions of the 3GPP document. In particular, the Office Action alleged that FIGS. 18 and 20, and sections 5, 5.1.1, 5.1.2 and 7 of 3GPP disclose

identifying a packet of a session to be intercepted based on media component information of the session. Applicants disagree and submit that 3GPP does not teach or suggest identifying a packet of a session to be intercepted <u>based on media component information</u>, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-13 are dependent, recites a method that includes identifying a packet of a session to be intercepted based on media component information of the session. The method further includes that if the packet to be intercepted is identified, providing duplicated packets of the session to an interception management element.

Claim 13, upon which claims 14-26 are dependent, recites a system that includes an intercepting node and an intercepting management element. The intercepting node is configured to identify a packet of a session to be intercepted based on media component information of the session, and to provide duplicated packets of the session to an interception management element if the packet to be intercepted is identified.

Claim 27 recites a system which includes identification means for identifying a packet of a session to be intercepted based on media component information of the session. The system further includes that if the packet to be intercepted is identified, providing means for providing duplicated packets of the session to an interception management element.

As will be discussed below, 3GPP fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claims, and therefore fails to provide the features discussed above.

3GPP is directed to a lawful interception architecture and includes other related features, as described throughout the document. Section 5 of 3GPP is directed to an overview of activation, deactivation and interrogation of a lawful intercept process. Section 5.1 (including 5.1.1, 5.1.2 and 5.1.3) of 3GPP discloses rules for activation/deactivation/interrogation of lawful interception, however, no media components are considered. (Emphasis added)

The Office Action also referred to section 7 of 3GPP as allegedly teaching media component information. Applicants respectfully disagree that section 7 provides any support for media component information. Section 7 discloses activation of lawful interception for packet data services. The Office Action, in particular, seemed to refer to the sentence "In case a Packet Data communication is selected based on several identities (MSISDN, IMSI, IMEI) of the same target, the 3G/SGSN ... will deliver the CC and IRI..." (lower third on page 24). The parameters listed above refer to a mobile station integrated services digital network (MSISDN), international mobile station identifier (IMSI), and international mobile equipment identity (IMEI). Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action wrongfully concluded that the above noted parameters represent media component information, as recited in claim 1.

The MSIDSN parameter is used to represent a mobile user's public address, otherwise referred to as a telephone number. IMSI represents the private address of a mobile user. The IMSI is globally unique and is composed of three parts, which include the mobile country code (MCC), identifying the country of the mobile user; the mobile

network code (MNC), identifying the mobile user's subscriber service; and the mobile user specific identity within the mobile operator. The IMSI parameter is used in GSM to identify and authenticate the user when registering with the network. Lastly, the IMEI (international mobile equipment identity) is a globally unique identifier for the mobile terminal that identifies the manufacturer in GSM networks, and which identifies the physical terminal to avoid usage of stolen or unauthorized terminals.

None of the above described parameters (MSISDN, IMSI and IMEI) used to identify a mobile terminal operating in a communication network in 3GPP are comparable to the media component information recited in claim 1. These identity parameters only serve to identify a user, and do not teach or suggest any type of media component information. Nowhere does 3GPP teach or suggest using media component information for identifying a session to be intercepted, as recited in claim 1. For example, the portion of page 24 of 3GPP which is cited in the Office Action states, "In case a Packet Data communication is selected based on several identities (MSISDN, IMSI, IMEI,)...3G GGSN will deliver...", only describes that packet data communication can be selected and <u>does not define that packets to be intercepted are identified based on media component information, as recited in claim 1</u>.

As stated above, 3GPP does not disclose all of the subject matter recited in claim 1, and similarly in claims 13 and 27. By virtue of dependency, claims 2-12, and 14-26 are also allowable over 3GPP. Withdrawal of the rejection and an allowance of those claims is kindly requested.

Claims 2-6 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over 3GPP in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0068454 to Oyama et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

3GPP is discussed above. Oyama discloses charging for services provided in a multimedia session. The multimedia session may be established over a radio access network. The system uses a token which is generated at the start of a session to keep track of session charges for operations performed throughout the session. Oyama does not disclose any type of lawful interception related to the subject matter recited in 3GPP. At best, the subject matter disclosed in Oyama defines a session identifier which can be used for identifying a specific session media flow (see page 6, paragraph [0072]).

Claims 2-6 and 14-17 are dependent on claims 1 and 13, respectively and inherit all of the claim limitations thereof. The combination of 3GPP and Oyama fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 13. Oyama fails to cure the deficiencies of 3GPP and fails to disclose identifying a packet of a session to be intercepted <u>based on media component information,</u> as recited in claims 1 and 13. Thus, the combination of 3GPP and Oyama fails to disclose or suggest all of the claim elements of claims 2-6 and 14-17. Furthermore, claims 2-6 and 14-17 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon claims 1 and 13, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

Claims 7-9 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over 3GPP in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0264200 to Laiho et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

3GPP is discussed above. Laiho discloses lawful interception of multimedia calls. A call initiation is detected via call detection equipment and forward and reverse channel parameters of the call are detected and forwarded to a gateway and transmitted to monitoring equipment. Laiho does not teach or suggest identifying a session to be intercepted based on media component information. Laiho is limited to lawful interception techniques which do not disclose the subject matter recited in the claims.

Claims 7-9 and 19-21 are dependent on claims 1 and 13, respectively and inherit all of the claim limitations thereof. The combination of 3GPP and Laiho fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 13. Laiho fails to cure the deficiencies of 3GPP and fails to disclose identifying a packet of a session to be intercepted based on media component information, as recited in claims 1 and 13. Thus, the combination of 3GPP and Laiho fails to disclose or suggest all of the claim elements of claims 7-9 and 19-21. Furthermore, claims 7-9 and 19-21 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon claims 1 and 13, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

Claims 10-11, 22-23 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over 3GPP in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/046663 to Temoshenko et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

3GPP is discussed above. Temoshenko discloses intercepting a packet based on source and destination address information. Temoshenko does not disclose any type of packet identification used to intercept the packets. Furthermore, Temoshenko does not teach or suggest identifying a session to be intercepted based on media component

information, as recited in claims 1 and 13. Temoshenko is limited to interception techniques based on address information which do not disclose the subject matter recited in the claims.

Claims 10-11, 22-23 and 25-26 are dependent on claims 1 and 13, respectively, and inherit all of the claim limitations thereof. As discussed above, the combination of 3GPP and Temoshenko fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 13. In addition, Temoshenko fails to cure the deficiencies of 3GPP and fails to disclose identifying a packet of a session to be intercepted based on media component information, as recited in claims 1 and 13. Thus, the combination of 3GPP and Temoshenko fails to disclose or suggest all of the claim elements of claims 10-11, 22-23 and 25-26. Furthermore, claims 10-11, 22-23 and 25-26 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon claims 1 and 13, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

Claims 12 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over 3GPP in view of Temoshenko and further in view of Oyama. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

3GPP, Temoshenko and Oyama are discussed above. Claims 12 and 24 are dependent on claims 1 and 13, respectively, and inherit all of the claim limitations thereof. As discussed above, the combination of 3GPP, Temoshenko and Oyama fail to disclose or suggest identifying a packet of a session to be intercepted based on media component information, as recited in claims 1 and 13. Thus, the combination of 3GPP Temoshenko, and Oyama fails to disclose or suggest all of the claim elements of claims

12 and 24. Furthermore, claims 12 and 24 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon claims 1 and 13, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. These distinctions are more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unanticipated and unobvious. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of the claims 1-27 be allowed, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

Kamran Emdadi
Registration No. 58,823

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800; Fax: 703-720-7802

KE:jkm:kh

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time
              Check No. 17440